



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

mw

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,994	12/22/2000	Paul Levi Williams JR.	088305/0121	7764

7590 02/05/2004

William T. Ellis
FOLEY & LARDNER
Suite 500
3000 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20007-5109

EXAMINER

BARTUSKA, FRANCIS JOHN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 02/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/741,994

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMS ET AL.

Examiner

F. J. BARTUSKA

Art Unit

3627

MW

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-7, 10, 11 and 13-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giovannoli in view of Barnes et al, both of

record. Giovannoli discloses a method and apparatus for providing electronic commerce including a host server at the "Central Office" of Fig. 4, obtaining requirements information from the buyers and sellers; such as, which buyers and sellers each will deal with, see col. 5, lines 15-27, determining products for the buyer based in part upon the requirements and obtaining registration information when the products are purchased.

Re claims 4-7, 22 and 23 common information would be stored separately from sensitive information, such as, credit card information, see col. 6, lines 2-6.

Giovannoli does not disclose that the information is exchanged in EDI format. Barnes et al disclose an electronic procurement system and method for trading partners and discloses using EDI format in col. 13, lines 5-8 and col. 25, lines 41-44. Further, Barnes et al teach in claim 11 that EDI, OBI, MIME, SMTP, HTTP and TCP/IP are well known interchangeable exchange protocols. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the showing and teaching of

Barnes et al to use EDI exchange protocols in the system and method of Giovannoli.

4. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giovannoli in view of Barnes et al as applied to claim 1 above in further view of Gabber et al. Giovannoli, as modified by Barnes et al, discloses all the features of the applicants' claimed invention except using cookies to track the system users. Gabber et al in col. 5, lines 15-27 teaches that it is well known to use cookies to track visitors to web sites. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the showing and teaching of Gabber et al to use cookies to track the users of the system of Giovannoli.

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giovannoli, in view of Barnes et al as applied to claim 1 above. Giovannoli, as modified by Barnes et al, discloses all the features of the applicants' claimed invention except generating return-on-investment information. Generating return-on-investment information would have involved only a notorious expedient in the art and even required by law when the products for sale are stocks and bonds. The particular articles

for sale would not distinguish patentably over the method and system of Giovannoli.

Response to Arguments

6. The applicant's remarks have been considered but have not been found persuasive because Barnes et al teach that EDI is well known exchange protocol in electronic commerce systems.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed,

and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to F. J. BARTUSKA whose telephone number is 703-308-1111. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-FRIDAY (ALTERNATE FRIDAYS OFF).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ROBERT P. OLSZEWSKI can be reached on 703-308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

fjb

F. J. BARTUSKA
PRIMARY EXAMINER